



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

III. — *The Diphthong -ui in Latin*

BY PROFESSOR RICHARD WELLINGTON HUSBAND

DARTMOUTH COLLEGE

THE union of the vowels *u* and *i* to form a diphthong is not recognized in the accepted system of Indo-European sounds. It exists in Greek only as the result of contraction following the loss of an intervening consonant, or as the result of some other secondary cause. Some of our modern grammarians hold that this diphthong occurs in Latin in three words, viz., in the datives *cui* and *huic*, and in the interjection *hui*. Wherever these two sounds come together elsewhere, *i* is regarded as the vowel of the syllable, while *u* is regarded as a consonantal element, attached to a preceding consonant, e.g., in *sequitur*, *coquit*, *quis*, etc., just as it is in *suavis*, *suadeo*, *quatio*, *equi*.

No evidence can well be adduced to prove or disprove the existence of a diphthong in the interjection *hui*, but the following facts lead one to think that *u* and *i* do not form a diphthong in the words *cui* and *huic* :—

(1) The Roman grammarians, when treating the diphthongs, do not include this one. From almost all lists and treatments of diphthongs it is regularly excluded. The following are the passages bearing on the point. Servius (*Comm. in Donatum*, K. iv, 423, 30): (diphthongi) sunt autem quattuor, *ae*, ut *Aeneas*; *oe*, ut *poena*; *au*, ut *aurum*; *eu*, ut *Eurus*. Cledonius (K. v, 29, 11): diphthongi istae quinque longae sunt, exceptis his quaecumque vocales iunctae fuerint, breves sunt, *ae oe au eu ei*. Pompeius (K. v, 115, 12): plane scire debes diphthongos longas esse. Sunt autem apud Latinos quattuor usitatae; nam una periit: *ae*, *Aeneas*, *oe*, *poena*, *au*, *aurum*, *eu*, ut est *Eurus*. Mallius Theodorus (K. vi, 586, 25): iunguntur vero inter se binae vocales, quas Graeci diphthongos vocant, *ae oe au eu ei*, quae syllabae semper longae sunt. Adsociantur itaque sic inter se vocales litterae, id est *i* et *u*, ut prior littera vim teneat consonantis,

ut *Iuno video*, quarum syllabarum ea condicio est, ut interdum longae sint, interdum breves. Two passages seem to show a slight contradiction, but the contradiction is only apparent, not real. Thus Diomedes (K. I, 427, 13): (syllabae longae sunt) natura, cum aut vocalis producitur, ut *a o*, aut duae vocales iunguntur, ut *ae oe au eu ui*. Diomedes does not illustrate, but his inclusion of *ui* is undoubtedly explained by the following passage from Priscian (K. II, 37, 11): invenitur haec eadem *ι* post *υ* in Graecis nominibus, ut *Ἀρπυια*: nam *υι* diphthongos est. The following from Marius Victorinus (K. VI, 26, 25) is self-explanatory: item alio modo sunt longae naturaliter syllabae, cum duae vocales iunguntur, quas syllabas Graeci diphthongos vocant, ut *ae oe au eu yi*: nam illae diphthongi non sunt quae fiunt per vocales loco consonantium positas, ut *ia ie ii io in, ua ue ui uo uu*. In treating the same subject a little later (32, 5) he says: syllabam faciunt natura longam, quam Graeci diphthongon vocant, veluti geminae vocis unum sonum, ut *ae oe au*.

In discussions of the pronunciation of *cui* and *huic*, mention is rarely made of a distinction between the vowel sound of these words and that of the nominative *qui*. The statement is made that the pronunciation of *qui* and *cui* is almost the same, and the orthography differs only *differentiae causa* (Quint. I, 7, 27. Ter. Saur. K. VII, 28, 1). This pronunciation is clearly indicated by two passages in Terentianus Maurus: porro cum praecedet *U*, consonantis vim ministrat omnibus vocalibus (K. VI, 341), and — namque *cui* si quando dico, non erit dissyllabon; nec tamen diphthongos ista consonante praedita poterit esse, quae videri non potest, cum libera est (K. VI, 674). It should be noted that Ter. Maur. devotes considerable space to proving that *-ui* is not a diphthong in *cui*. This is especially valuable in view of the fact that, while the other grammarians indicate their opinion by omitting *-ui* from their list of diphthongs, he affords us the best possible evidence on the positive side by his argument against its inclusion.

Two grammarians, however, give a somewhat different account. Caesellius says (K. VII, 202, 27): *qui*, si una syl-

laba est, per *q* litteram scribendum est, ut *qui homo*; si duae, per *c*, ut *cui homini*. And Annaeus Cornutus says (K. vii, 149, 1-10): *q* littera tunc recte ponitur, cum illi statim *u* littera et alia quaelibet una pluresve vocales coniunctae fuerint, ita ut una syllaba fiat; cetera per *c* scribuntur. . . . *qui* syllaba per *q u i* scribitur; si dividitur, ut sit *cui* ut *huic*, per *c*. Hoc item in ceteris notabimus, ut divisionem *c* littera sequatur. Here the words *dividitur*- and *divisionem* refer to a separation into two syllables, and the two passages are clearly intended to mean that the datives *cui* and *huic* are dissyllabic, while the nominative *qui* is monosyllabic.

(2) In connection with the statements of Caesellius and Annaeus Cornutus, it is important to notice that not infrequently *cui* and *huic* are scanned as dissyllables in post-Augustan poetry. Some editors have written *quoui* as a dissyllable in early poetry, e.g. Brix in Plaut. *Trin.* 358 and 558, but that is now generally given up. Plotius (K. vi, 512, 2) holds unnecessarily that *cui* in *Aen.* i, 522 is a pyrrhic. The earliest undoubted instances of *cui* used as a dissyllable are Sen. *Troad.* 852; Juv. 3, 49; 7, 211; Mart. i, 104, 22; 8, 52, 3; 11, 72, 2; 12, 49, 3, always scanned as a pyrrhic. It is also found as a pyrrhic in Ter. Maur. (e.g. 183, 234, etc.), and in Damasus (*Hymnus de S. Agatha* 15). Its earliest occurrence as an iambus is in Albinus (Baehrens, *Fragm. Poet. Rom.* 406, 1), where it is so used twice in three verses. In very late poetry it is found both as a pyrrhic and as an iambus, although its use as an iambus becomes increasingly frequent.

Priscian (K. iii, 10, 21) points out that *huic* is rarely used as a dissyllable, and cites two occurrences in the *Silvae* of Statius (i, 107; 2, 135), where the position in both passages leaves it unclear whether the word is a pyrrhic or an iambus. Other instances, all late, are cited by Neue (*Formenlehre*, ii, p. 415), indicating that the usage was unsettled. Even the same author varies, e.g. Ter. Maur., who uses it twice as an iambus, three times as a pyrrhic.

If we regard *i* as the vowel of these two words, and *u* as a consonant, it would be expected that the words would always

be iambic when dissyllabic, and the phenomenon of their becoming dissyllabic comparable to the vocalizing of *u* by Lucretius in *sūēscō*, *sūādeo*, *sūāvis*, and the like, e.g. 1, 60; 4, 1157, etc.; cp. *consūēmus* in Propertius 1, 7, 5; and note by Munro on Lucr. 4, 1157. The scansion as a pyrrhic may indeed be a reminiscence of the total quantity of the long monosyllable. But the chief point here is not the quantity of the two syllables when the words become dissyllabic, but rather the fact that they become dissyllabic at all. In many forms of Greek poetry diphthongs are resolved, but Latin is very tenacious of its diphthongs. Resolution does not occur. It is necessary, therefore, to conclude that the two words were often dissyllabic in ordinary pronunciation, or, expressed in other words, that *u* is consonantal, and is sometimes in late poetry separated from its preceding consonant and used as a vowel.

The Italian monosyllabic nominative *chi* and the dissyllabic dative *cui* have sometimes been cited to show that a difference in pronunciation existed between the Latin nominative *qui* and the dative *cui*. The difference in Italian does prove that the Latin nominative was monosyllabic, while in popular pronunciation the dative was dissyllabic (Wiese, *Altitalienisches Elementarbuch*, 131; D'Ovidio-Meyer-Lübke, *Grundr. d. roman. Phil.* 1, p. 662, § 36). This is borne out by the statement of Audax (K. VII, 329, 7) that *cui* and *rei* are often scanned in verse as if they were monosyllables, whereas they are really dissyllables.

(3) So many theories have been given to account for the forms *cui* and *huic* that it seems hardly worth while to offer another. The earliest occurring forms are *quoiei* (*CIL.* 1, 34, 198, etc.) and *hoice* (*CIL.* 1, 197). The form *quoiei* justifies the assumption that a still earlier form of *hoice* was **hoieice*. These can by no known phonetic laws develop into the classical monosyllables. That is to say, the monosyllabic *quoi* and *hoic*, which were the standard literary forms until the beginning of the imperial period, could not possibly have developed regularly from the earliest assumed forms. But these earliest forms would change with perfect regularity into

the dissyllabic forms of the silver age, and become the parents of dissyllabic forms in Italian. The monosyllabic forms *quōi* and *hoīc*, since they are both proclitic, should develop naturally into **quī* and **hīc*. Lindsay's explanation of their history is quite wrong, that "when the *oi* sank to *uī*, the *qu* (of *quōi*) by a law of Latin phonetics became *c*" (*Lat. Lang.* p. 445). It is impossible that *oi* should sink to *uī*, nor is there a law of Latin phonetics whereby *qu* should become *c* in such position. The four forms *hoīus*, *quōius*, *hoīc*, and *quōi* seem to fall together. In *hoīus* and *quōius* it is natural to assume that -i- was a consonantal sound belonging to both first and second syllables. The change from *hoīus* to *huius* involves only a change from *ō* to *ū* in an unaccented syllable, provided we assume that the vowel of the root always remained short. That the first syllable of *huius*, *cuius*, etc., was unaccented has been shown by Skutsch (*Forschungen zur lateinischen Grammatik*; cp. Radford, *TAPA*. xxxv, pp. 36 ff.). If, however, the root vowel became long before -i- the change from *hōius* to *hūius* would be similar to the change in *hūc*, *fūr*, *rūdus*. The change of *quōius* to *cuius* would take place naturally, with *quō* becoming *cū*, in the Augustan age, provided the root vowel remained short. If it became long, the change of *quōr* to *cūr* is parallel, and association with *huius* would hasten the change. The new forms *huius* and *cuius* supplied new stems, and these stems influenced the datives *quōi* (which had now become **quī* in pronunciation) and *hoīc*, changing them to *cūi* and *hūic*, which are the common literary forms.